DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 305 670 CS 506 541

AUTHOR Arnold, Christa L.; Fadely, Dean
TITLE New Directions in Conflict Research and Theory: Conflict-Management through the Rhetoric of Compliance-Gaining Apologia.
PUB DATE Jun 89
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Association for Conflict Management (Athens, GA, June 11-14, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Compliance (Psychology); Conflict; Discourse Analysis; *Persuasive Discourse; *Rhetorical Criticism; Speeches
IDENTIFIERS Apologies; Conflict Management; Conflict Theory; Religious Broadcasting; Rhetorical Effectiveness; *Rhetorical Strategies; Rhetorical Theory; *Swaggart (Jimmy)

ABSTRACT

The study of conflict and its management is diverse in that it involves many academic disciplines, sub-disciplines, and specific situations. One aspect of this diversity can be found in the revelations regarding television evangelists such as Jim and Tammy Faye Bakker, Oral Roberts, and Jimmy Swaggart. The effects arising out of the publication of Swaggart's sexual relations with a prostitute make for an especially interesting case study which involves the integration of compliance-gaining strategies and theoretical aspects of the genre of apologia: Swaggart endeavored to manage conflict, reduce dissonance, and institute damage control in an effort to repair his character and ministry. All apologias rely upon the use of four strategies--denial, bolstering, differentiation, and transcendence. Speakers can assume one of four rhetorical tactics when implementing the foregoing strategies: absolution, vindication, explanation, or justification. Compliance-gaining can be described as symbolic behavior aimed towards shaping or regulating the behavior and/or opinion of others. Compliance-gaining strategies are based upon sanction (promise, ingratiation, esteem, aversive stimulation, and guilt) and need (altruism and explanation). An examination of Swaggart's speech, aimed at apology/forgiveness with a final goal of compliance-gaining from the audience so that the ministry could continue, reveals that he applied strategies of compliance-gaining and apologia as manipulative rhetorical tools. (Forty footnotes are included.) (MM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED305670

NEW DIRECTIONS IN CONFLICT RESEARCH AND THEORY:

Conflict-Management Through the Rhetoric of Compliance-Gaining Apologia

by

Christa L. Arnold and Dean Fadely

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Accepted for presentation as a paper at:

The 1989 Conference of

The International Association for Conflict Management

Athens, Georgia, U.S.A.

June 11-14, 1989

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Christa Arnold

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS506541

The study of conflict and its management is diverse in that it involves many academic disciplines, sub-disciplines, and specific situations. One aspect of this diversity can be found in the revelations regarding television evangelists such as Jim and Tammy Fae Bakker, Oral Roberts, and Jimmy Swaggart. The effects arising out of the publication of Swaggart's sexual relations with a prostitute from the Big Easy make for an especially interesting case study which involves the integration of compliance-gaining strategies and theoretical aspects of the genre of apologia; Swaggart endeavored to manage conflict, reduce dissonance, and institute damage control in an effort to repair his character and ministry.

The idea of genre, traditionally associated with literary criticism, has emerged as a concept associated with rhetorical discourse. Edwin Black's book Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method, helped to make the idea of genre standard in the area of rhetorical theory. Black defined genre as "...congregations of rhetorical discourses that share similar strategies, situations, and effects."[1] Karyln Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson subsequently defined genre as "...a classification based on the fusion and interrelation of elements in such a way that a unique kind of rhetorical act is created."[2] Campbell and Jamieson hold that a genre is given character by a "...fusion of forms not by it's individual elements."[3]

Rhetorical acts in a particular genre tend to be classified

or categorized according to settings, reasons for production, and elements that are motivational precedents which characterize the specific genre. The rhetorical discourse exhibits the situational, or motivational features of the genre. Strategies, situational factors, overlapping functions, and the interrelation of elements obviously play an important role in the effectiveness of a particular rhetorical act regardless of it's genre. The following discussion will examine the strategies and elements involved in two specific types of rhetorical acts: apologia and compliance-gaining. The treatment will include: (1) a review and discussion of the major works and strategies involved in the genre of apologia; (2) a review and discussion of the major works and strategies of compliance-gaining discourse; and (3) an assessment of Jimmy Swaggart's speech of apology[4] applying elements of apologia and compliance-gaining.

APOLOGIA

Ware and Linkugel, in their well known article "They Spoke in Defense of Themselves," argued that "apologetical discourses constitute a distinct form of public address, a family of speeches with sufficient elements in common so as to warrant legitimate generic status."[5] Several years later Noreen Kruse defined the genre of apologia as:

> ...public discourse produced whenever a prominent person attempts to repair his character if it has been directly or indirectly damaged by overt charges, or rumors and allegations which negatively value his behavior and/or his judgment.[6]

The varying strategies, situations, and circumstances surrounding

apologia help make each one unique. However, regardless of the extent of their individuality, all apologia's rely upon the use of four strategies: denial, bolstering, differentiation, and transcendence.7 These strategies may be used separately, simultaneously, or they may overlap one another.

The discourse of denial consists of the "...simple disavowal by the speaker of any participation in, relationship to, or positive sentiment toward whatever it is that repels the audience."8 Bolstering as a component of apologia is applied when a "speaker attempts to identify himself with something viewed favorably by the audience."9 Differentiation "...subsumes those strategies which serve the purpose of separating some fact, sentiment, object or relationship from some larger context within which the audience presently views that attribute."10 It often surfaces in apologia when the accused requests a forbearance of judgment until after the questionable actions are examined from a different perspective. The final strategy of apologia is transcendence, which is the obverse of differentiation, and is transformative in the sense that strategies which "...involve a change in cognitive identification and in meaning factor together as transcendence."11

Speakers can assume one of the following four rhetorical tactics when implementing any or all of the foregoing strategies: absolution, vindication, explanation, or justification.12 The tactic of absolution combines differentiation and denial strategies, with an objective of

acquittal. The vindication tactic relies heavily upon transcendence and is aimed at preserving the speaker's reputation. It highlights the speaker's worth as a human being. With the explanation approach, the rhetor contends that if the audience truly understands and believes the speaker's motives and actions, then the audience will support acquittal. Finally, with the justification tactic, the speaker goes beyond addressing motives and actions and asks for complete approval.13

As apologia involves a rhetor's attempt to reverse a derogatory charge thus resulting in a more favorable view of the speaker's character, elements of manipulation and compliance-gaining appear in most apology speeches. Accordingly, we logicaly next examine the characteristics, strategies, and situational appropriateness of the rhetorical acts of compliance-gaining.

COMPLIANCE-GAINING

Compliance-gaining strategies have developed as a new area of interest in the field of communication. Compliance-gaining can be described as symbolic behavior aimed towards shaping or regulating the behavior and/or opinion of others. Compliance-gaining has also been described as "...strategic verbal choice-making" which plays a key role in communication.14 There are a variety of situations in which a speaker seeks compliance from the listeners. This compliance-gaining act may take the form of a request, or "favor asking," but, regardless of how the act is presented, the structure is self-serving.15

Compliance-gaining, like apologia, is also a fusion of elements and strategies to form a created rhetorical act. While compliance-gaining is dependent on individual circumstances and therefore may apply different strategies according to situational needs, compliance-gaining behavior centers upon an attempt on the part of the communication source to effect a preconceived response from the target or receiver of the persuasive effort.[16] Although the speaker may sometimes consciously choose a message strategy in order to receive a desired response, such is not always the case. As Schenck-Hamlin, Wiseman, and Georgacarakos have indicated:

> While we cannot claim that goal specificity is a characteristic of all compliance-gaining episodes, we argue that it is an important determinant of effectiveness.[17]

Gerald Marwell and David Schmitt were pioneers in the investigation of strategies to be applied in compliance-gaining situations.[18] Together they developed sixteen compliance-gaining strategies. The strategies of compliance-gaining most relevant to this discussion extend beyond the dyadic encounter, and are geared more toward the group or large audience. These strategies are based upon sanction (promise, ingratiation, esteem, aversive stimulation, and guilt), and need (altruism and explanation).[19] To better understand these strategies, we will examine each one separately.

Strategies based on sanction have the commonality of reward and punishment--the proverbial carrot and stick. Promise

consists of a situation in which the:

> Actor's proffered goods, sentiments, or services are promised to the target in exchange for compliance. This may include a bribe or trade-off, log-rolling, or finding a `middle of the road' solution. [20]

Ingratiation is a strategy of sanction in which the:

> Actor's proffered goods, sentiments, or services precede the request for compliance. They range from subtle verbal or nonverbal positive reinforcement to more blatant formulas of `apple polishing' or `brown nosing.' Manipulations in behavior include gift giving, supportive listening, love and affection, or favor-doing. [21]

Esteem constitutes a case in which the:

> Target's compliance will result in automatic increase of self-worth. Actor's appeal promises this increase in areas of target's power, success, status, moral/ethical standing, attention and affection of others, competence, ability to handle failure and uncertainty will, and/or attempts to aspire. [22]

Unless the receipient is a masochist, aversive stimulation is a strategy of sanction which consists of punishment only--the stick without the carrot:

> Actor continuously punishes target, making cessation contingent on compliance: pouting, sulking, crying, acting angry, whining, the silent treatment, and ridicule would all be examples of aversive stimulation. [23]

The final sanction strategy, guilt, consists of a situation in which the:

> Target's failure to comply will result in automatic decreases of self-worth. Areas of inadequacy might include professional ineptness, social irresponsibility, or ethical/moral transgressions. [24]

Although many compliance-gaining strategies are based on sanction, there are also strategies based on need. Altruism is a need strategy in which:

> Actor requests the target to engage in behavior designed to benefit the actor rather than the target. Presentation of some personal need and asking for help is typical. Intensity of the appeal may be manipulated by making the target feel unselfish, generous, self-sacrificing, heroic, or helpful. `It would help me if you would do this,' and `do a favor for me,' exemplify the direct approach of the altruistic strategy.[25]

The final need strategy, explanation, suggests that:

> One of several reasons are typically advanced for believing or doing something. A reason may include the following: (1) credibility, `I know from experience.' The reason for complying is because of trustworthiness, integrity, exemplary action, or expertise; (2) inference from empirical evidence, `Everything points to the logic of this step.' The reason for complying is based on the following evidence.[26]

The literature treating apologia and compliance-gaining indicates that the effectiveness of each strategy varies depending on individual and situational differences. With apologia, the sense of preserving one's character appears to be a primary motive, however, some apologetic rhetoric may go beyond self-preservation. If this is the case, then the rhetor may select strategies with the intent to persuade or gain compliance. In this situation the strategies of compliance-gaining may be effective. Noreen Kruse suggests that a public oration of apology contains intentions not only to repair damaged ethos and morality, but is also an obvious step towards gaining respect and therefore compliance from the audience.[27] In fact, a rhetor may target compliance as the primary goal using a mixture of strategies such as denial, aversive stimulation, or the acknowledgement of error, fault, or even guilt (**mea culpa**), as a

method of self-preservation. Is it possible that strategies of apologia and compliance-gaining overlap and therefore are mutually inclusive? The genre of apologia has a legitimate historical acceptance, whereas compliance-gaining is a reasonably new area of research and lacks rhetorical classification. We contend that the strategies and interrelating elements of apologia and compliance-gaining discussed in this paper constitute a particular form, or sub-genre, and we would argue that the previous discussion of apologia and compliance-gaining support this contention. Additional support for our position may be achieved through an evaluation of a public oration of apology focusing upon strategies used during the rhetorical act. We offer such an assessment in order to better understand the interrelationships between apologia and compliance-gaining discourses.

The speech selected for this evaluation is one delivered by Pentecostal Preacher Jimmy Swaggart who's recent fall from grace placed him in a position of self-defense and self-preservation. Knowing that televangelism is a multi-million dollar operation and that Jimmy Swaggart is the backbone of the Swaggart TV ministry, important questions surface: Was his public apology solely for the purpose of a religious confession? Was the purpose of the speech one of expressing regret to his congregation? Or was it, as our investigation indicates, a speech aimed at apology/forgiveness with a final goal of compliance-gaining from the audience so that the ministry could

continue it's multi-million dollar operation? A look into Jimmy Swaggart's background and the industry of televangelism sheds some light as to why his speech of apology was necessary in order to maintain Swaggart's livelihood as a TV minister.

"SIN IS THE CANCER ON THE BODY OF CHRIST'

-JIMMY SWAGGART

Jimmy Swaggart has been described as one of the most controversial and popular television evangelists. Ted Koppel once depicted him as "the master of communication" and, more vividly as, "the linebacker of a preacher sacking Satan."[28] Swaggart is fifty-three years old, six feet tall with honey colored hair and a slight southern cadence in his voice. He is married to Frances Swaggart and has one son, Donnie, who is "thirty-something." Both Frances and Donnie serve on the board of directors of Jimmy Swaggart Ministries. As of 1986, the yearly income of Swaggart's Ministries was estimated at over $140 million dollars. Swaggart claims that his annual salary is less than $100,000 a year and describes his crusading ministry as the "old sawdust trail, sort of upgraded."[29] Jimmy Swaggart's crusades and ministries reach across the United States and into dozens of foreign countries, with approximately eight million viewers every Sunday. Television ministries such as Swaggart's, have enabled people to bring the gospel into their own homes. The industry of the electric ministry is a fast-growing, multi-million dollar operation. Gospel broadcasters produce an income of approximately two billion dollars per year.[30]

However, the last few years of electronic evangelism have seen scandal, sex, and greed. To some critics, along with

concerned supporters, the electronic religious industry appears to be more concerned "with bucks than Bibles" and more of a personality cult following than a Christ following.[31] The TV preachers constantly plead for donations in order to stay on the air and continue their religious commitments. Yet, some televangelists have been reluctant to discuss what they do with the millions of dollars they receive. Evangelical Theologian Carl F.J. Henry predicts the occurrence of a "...growing pressure for public financial accountability from all religious broadcasters who solicit funds over the airwaves." Additionally, he argues: "The personal life-styles of those who appeal for sacrificial support will also come under more scrutiny by the churches and by a skeptical society." [32] The last few years have seen such scrutiny by society not only of the churches, but of the evangelists themselves. The revelations regarding the Reverend Jim Bakker and the Praise The Lord (PTL) club began what seemed to be a series of scandals. In March, 1987, Reverened Jim Bakker was ousted as the leader of PTL when it was discovered that he had been involved in an extra-marital relationship with a church secretary, Jessica Hahn, and had also been a party to the payment of $265,000 in hush money to cover up the scandal.[33]

Several popular televangelists had their own public and personal criticisms of the Bakker scandal. None of these "messengers of the Lord" publicly supported their fellow TV minister, Jim Bakker, or his wife, Tammy. Rather, Jimmy Swaggart commented that the Bakker scandal was a "cancer that needed to be

exised from the body of Christ."34 And Jerry Falwell described the Bakker scandal as a "backwash that could hurt every Gospel ministry in America, if not the world."35 The Reverend Pat Robertson, who at the time was a Republican Presidential candidate, commented that "the Lord is housecleaning a little bit" and that he was glad to see it happen.36

One effect of the Bakker scandal was a financial plunge, not only for the PTL, but for other TV ministries as well. Specifically, Falwell admitted that donations were down $2 million in April of 1987. Jimmy Swaggart also reported a decline of $1.5 million dollars for the month of April. Pat Robertson, former host of religious television's top rated program, the "700 club", reported a 33% decrease in donations during the month of April and, as a result, laid off 500 employees in June.37

The Bakker scandal also obviously affected public opinion. George Gallup Jr. polled 1,026 Americans concerning fund raising by Christian organizations. The question asked was whether Christian fund raising was honest. While forty-seven percent of those polled believed that it was, forty percent thought that "some" or "very little" of evangelical programming could be deemed trustworthy.38 Furthermore, the public as a whole was neither supportive nor understanding of Jim Bakker's immoral actions or opulent lifestyle, and both he and Tammy Fae were forced to abandon their ministry.

Approximately one year after the Bakker-Hahn affair became public knowledge, or gossip, televangelist Jimmy Swaggart was

accused of sexual misconduct. At first, Swaggart denied charges and accusations of sexual liasons with multiple women. However, irrefutable evidence finally forced Jimmy Swaggart to admit to having engaged in sexual activities with a veteran prostitute. These revelations led to another scandal. Yet, unlike Jim Bakker, Jimmy Swaggart faced his public with a televised religious confession. After having seen Reverend Bakker ousted from his religious empire for reasons involving sexual misconduct, why would Swaggart attempt a public confession admitting his guilt?

There appear to be several possible answers: Perhaps Swaggart felt the need to apologize -- to "get right with God." If this was his purpose, then why publicly apologize, why not privately confess?[39] Perhaps, Swaggart believed that the significance of Bakker's plight could have been reduced had he publicly apologized -- a sort of apologia of damage control. Perhaps, money was an issue as Swaggart sensed that without a public apology his donations would drastically decline. Whatever his motivation, Swaggart decided to speak to his congregation concerning his involvement with Debra Murphree, a local prostitute.

Standing before a church filled to capacity, and with his family, as well as millions of television viewers watching, Jimmy Swaggart began his confession with an admission of guilt: "I do not plan to white wash my sin...I have no one to blame but myself...sin was done in secret, blessed be the name of the

Lord." While there is no logical connection between sin, (whether it be done in secret or in public), and "blessed be the name of the Lord," there is a psychological relevance. Placing an emphasis on the Lord and carrying a Bible in his hand helped differentiate Jimmy Swaggart the human minister, from Jesus Christ the Lord. Swaggart continued his speech by bolstering the media, a tactic opposite his usual approach,40 calling them fair, correct, and even objective. Although Swaggart obviously was confessing guilt, he neither admitted to, nor described, his specific sin(s). As his entire speech neither addressed his sin(s) with a prostitute, nor how long he had been committing these sin(s), Swaggart was actually using an indirect form of denial in that he never directly commented upon the exact nature of his immoral actions.

Swaggart addressed those whom he had wronged, beginning with his wife, Frances. During the speech, Swaggart looked directly at Frances, constantly bolstering and ingratiating her by stating that "God could not have blessed a man with a better woman than my wife". He let the audience know that Frances' redeemer was and is the Lord Jesus Christ, thus transcending the audience away from Swaggart and his sin in question. Swaggart spoke to Frances saying: "I have sinned against you and I beg for your forgiveness...redemption is in the name of the Lord." Frances, while not crying or smiling, certainly was not looking happy; she just made a hesitant nod, not an obvious gesture of complete forgiveness or compliance. Swaggart continued to address those

whom he wronged by admitting his guilt in having sinned against them. Those people included his son, Donnie, and daughter-in-law Debbie. During this portion of the speech, Donnie cried, mouthed "I love you" and nodded in obvious agreement to forgive his father. Debbie, while not crying, did hesitantly nod, perhaps in agreement -- perhaps only in understanding. Like her mother-in-law, she too did not look happy. As Swaggart continued his confession, he began to tear, cry and quiver, a definite sign of aversive stimulation. This aversive stimulation allowed the audience to see Swaggart's sincerity and suffering, with Swaggart as the communication source (actor) punishing Swaggart the sinner (target). The crying and begging for forgiveness during the speech produced a profound effect on his congregation. At times, members were clapping, crying, and standing up in ovation. Swaggart continued-- begging for forgiveness from his church, the Bible college, (students and faculty), the Assemblies of God, and the television audience. This begging for forgiveness and forbearance was clearly a strategy of altruism, through which Swaggart sought to demonstrate his need for forgiveness and sympathy, while at the same time, using his connection with God to help justify his audience's compliance.

As the speech continued, Swaggart intensified his request for forgiveness by using the strategies of differentiation and transcendence in the context of using Bible verses, and confessing to the higher judge(s), God and Jesus Christ. Swaggart's confession to a higher power can be used as a

justification for a forbearance in judgment on the part of his audience. Swaggart tried to achieve this goal by quoting Bible verses and bolstering his audience's belief in God (transcendence). The desired result of this tactic was to change his audience's focus -- moving their attention away from his sexual misconduct and toward their common religious ground. Swaggart used this particular combination of strategies throughout his address. Examples of his appeals to forgive his sin(s) based on religious reasons include: " My sin is in the seas of God's forgetfulness, never to be remembered again... please forgive me, I know my redeemer well...the Lord forgives sin upon confession ...the sin is not a present sin but a past sin...sinners shall be converted." With these strategies, Swaggart maneuvered his audience by establishing common ground through mutual belief in the Lord, thereby enabling the audience to answer in the affirmative the question: Should Jimmy Swaggart be forgiven? To achieve this desired answer, Swaggart used the following chain of reasoning:

-The Bible tells us that the Lord forgives upon confession.
-Jimmy Swaggart has confessed to the Lord.
-Therefore, the Lord has forgiven Jimmy Swaggart.

-The Bible tells us that we are to follow our God.
-Our God has forgiven Jimmy Swaggart.
-Therefore, we should forgive Swaggart.

In addition to previously discussed strategies, Swaggart also utilized bolstering, esteem, promise and explanation techniques during the speech. Swaggart spoke about the ministry's

successes around the world. He continued to bolster the ministry by mentioning the success of the college, the students, the faculty, the church, and their relationships with the Lord, thereby implying causality on the part of Jimmy Swaggart's ministry. Swaggart eventually bolsters himself and builds his personal esteem by calling himself "the vessel of the Lord." Through this avenue he was able to infer a possible explanation for his actions by saying that "maybe Jimmy Swaggart hasn't lived his whole life as a human...maybe he tried to be God-like and not human."

The explanative address, as a strategy of apologia, states that the speaker will not be convicted if the audience truly understands the speaker's actions. Swaggart made a promise to his audience concerning the "punishment" for his actions: "I will step out of the ministry for an indeterminant amount of time, which will be determined by the Lord." Again, Swaggart made the differentiation between the members of the Assemblies of God handing down his punishment, versus the Lord handing him his sentence. He continued transcending his audience away from his personal sin and to the organization by asking "will this ministry continue?" and replying, "yes, the ministry will continue...the Bible college will continue." Inferred in these statements is a persuasive plea which Swaggart made explicit in subsequent broadcasts: "Keep up your sacrificial support in the name of the Lord, for the work of the Lord." In other words: send money.

Swaggart asked and his listener's complied. From this perspective, the speech was successful. However, other conclusions regarding Swaggart's speech can also be drawn. Swaggart's apologia/confession reveals a definite intent to persuade his audience. Elements of compliance-gaining and apologia were interrelated and overlapped throughout Swaggart's speech. He effectively manuevered these strategies and avoided addressing any specifics of his sin(s). Several findings emerge from assessing Jimmy Swaggart's apologia: (1) He went beyond the purpose of a true religious confession. (2) There is evidence of a conscious intent to persuade, manage conflict, reduce dissonance, and to implement damage control. (3) He applied strategies of compliance-gaining and apologia as manipulative rhetorical tools. And, (4) finally, Swaggart's speech demonstrated the use of a sub-genre, in that it was a particular form of the genre of apologia, specifically, compliance-gaining apologia as opposed to a confessional apologia, or an apologia of regret. All of the aforementioned types of apologia could be associated with many conflict situations, especially those involving religious personages.

NOTES

[1]Edwin Black, Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method, (Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1978, p. 134.)

[2]Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson, Form and Genre, (Falls Church, Virginia: Speech Communication Association, 1976, p. 25).

[3]Ibid., p. 21

[4]Sponsored by Jimmy Swaggart Ministries, Baton Rouge Louisiana. Televised speech delivered by Jimmy Swaggart. Broadcast date, February 21, 1988. References to Swaggart's speech of apology are from a video tape recording of this speech.

[5]B.L. Ware and Will A. Linkugel, "They Spoke in Defense of Themselves: On the Generic Criticism of Apologia," Quarterly Journal of Speech 59 (1973): p. 275.

[6]Noreen W. Kruse, "Motivational Factors in Non-Denial Apologia, "Central States Speech Journal 28 (1977): p. 13. She has also described the genre of apologia as "...a grouping of speeches based on situations and circumstances surrounding a speech defending one's character, and mending of one's ethos." "The Scope of Apologetic Discourse: Establishing Generic Parameters," Southern Speech Communication Journal 46 (1981): p. 279. For further evaluations and discussions of apologia, see: B.L. Ware and Wil A. Linkugel, "They Spoke in Defense of Themselves: On the Generic Criticism of Apologia"; B.L. Jackson Harrell, B.L. Ware, and Wil A. Linkugel, "Failure of Apology in American Politics: Nixon on Watergate," Communication Monographs 42 (1975): 245-261; Edwin Black, Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method,; Campbell and Jamieson, Form and Genre; Ellen Reid Gold, "Political Apologia: The Ritual of Self-Defense," Communication Monographs 45 (1978): 306-316; Bernard Brock and Robert Scott, A Twentieth-Century Criticism, (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1980); Robert L. King, "Transforming Scandal into Tragedy: A Rhetoric of Political Apology, "Quarterly Journal of Speech 71 (1985): 289-301.

Authors' Harrell, Ware and Linkugel (1975) discuss apologia as a strategic verbal defense in which the "rhetor fashions to extricate himself from the situation" (p. 246). These authors contend that personal legitimacy is most basically grounded in "perceived honesty, largely a moral perception of the rhetor drawn by the public" (p. 260). Noreen Kruse (1981) specifies that "discourses can only be defined as apologia if the rhetor's actions have led to public criticism of their characters or if the rhetors believe their behaviors have caused people to

consider them immoral or unethical" (p. 280). However, Ware and Linkugel (1973) suggest that questioning a man's moral nature and worth as a human being is qualitatively different from challenging his policies. Therefore, an attack on a person's character, moral nature, and reputation requires a direct response (p. 274). Usually this direct response is in the form of a public address involving elements such as self defense, apology, and an emphasis on the positive aspects of this person's character.

[7]Ware and Linkugel, "They Spoke in Defense of Themselves," pp. 276-282.

[8]Robert P. Abelson, Theories of Cognitive Consistency, (Chicago, Illinois: Rand McNally,1969, pp344-345.) For an example of apologia using denial strategies see: Clarence Darrow's "They Tried to Get Me" speech in Arthur Weinberg's, Attorney for the Damned, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1957, pp 494-531).

[9]Ware and Linkugel, "They Spoke in Defense of Themselves: On Generic Criticism of Apologia," p 277. Effective usage of the bolstering strategy was applied in Senator Edward Kennedy's "Chappaquiddick" address.

[10] Ware and Linkugel, "They Spoke in Defense of Themselves," p. 278.

[11] Ibid., p. 280. Psychologically speaking, transcendence moves the audience away from the particular and most likely negative charge at hand.

[12]Ibid., pp. 282-283.

[13]Ibid., pp. 282-283.

[14]Ruth Anne Clark and Jesse G. Delia, "Topoi and Rhetorical Competence, "Quarterly Journal of Speech 65 (1979): p 195.

[15]Karen Tracy, Robert T. Craig, Martin Smith, and Frances Spisak, "The Discourse of Requests: Assessment of a Compliance-Gaining Approach, "Human Communication Research 10 (1984): 513-538.

[16]Gerald R. Miller and Mark Steinberg, Between People, (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1975).

[17]William J. Schenck-Hamlin, Richard L. Wiseman, and G.N. Georgacarakos, "A Model of Properties of Compliance-Gaining Strategies, "Communication Quarterly 30 (1982): p. 93.

[18]Gerald Marwell and Davie R. Schmitt, "Dimensions of Compliance-Gaining Behavior: An Empirical Analysis," Sociometry 39 (1967): 350-364.

[19]Ibid., pp.357-358.

[20]Schenck-Hamlin, Wiseman, and Georgacarokos, "A Model of Properties of Compliance-Gaining Strategies," p. 95.

[21]Ibid, p. 95.

[22]Ibid., p. 95.

[23]Ibid., p. 95

[24]Ibid., p. 95.

[25]Ibid., p. 95.

[26]For further discussion on compliance-gaining strategies see: Franklin J. Boster, and James B. Stiff, "Compliance-Gaining Message Selection Behavior,"Human Communication Research 10, 4 (1984), 539-556; Michael J. Cody, and Margaret L. McLaughlin, "Perceptions of Compliance-Gaining Situations: A Dimensional Approach,"Communication Monographs, 47 (1980), 132-148; Michael J. Cody, William J. Jordan, and Mary Lou Woelfel, "Dimensions of Compliance-Gaining Situations,"Human Communication Research 9 (1983): 99-113; Mark A. deTurk, "A Transactional Analysis of Compliance-Gaining Behavior: Effects of Noncompliance, Relational Contexts, and Actor's Gender,"Human Communication Research 12 (1985): 54-78; James P. Dillard, and Michael Burgoon, " Situational Influences on the Selection of Compliance-Gaining Messages: Two Tests of the Predictive Utility of The Cody-McLaughlin Typology,"Communication Monographs 52 (1985), 289-304; Marwell and Schmitt, "Dimensions of Compliance-Gaining;" Schenck-Hamlin, et.al., "A Model of Properties of Compliance-Gaining Strategies;" Clark and Delia, "Topoi and Rhetorical Competence;" Karen Tracy, Robert T. Craig, Martin Smith and Frances Spisak, "The Discourse of Requests: Assessment of a Compliance-Gaining Approach, "Human Communication Research 10 (1984): 513-538; William J. Schenck-Hamlin, G.N. Georgacarakos, and Richard L. Wiseman, "A Formal Account of Interpersonal Compliance-Gaining, "Communication Quarterly 30 (1982): 173-180; M. Lee Williams, and Nancy K. Untermeyer, "Compliance-Gaining Strategies and Communicator Role: An Analysis of Strategy Choices and Persuasive Efficacy," Communication Research Reports 5 (1988): 10-18.

[27]Kruse, "The Scope of Apologetic Discourse: Establishing Generic Parameters," p. 279.

[28]Ted Koppel, American Broadcasting Company, Nightline, (February 22, 1988).

[29]Richard Ostling, "TV's Unholy Row,"Time (April 6, 1987): p. 63.

[30]Ibid., p. 60.

[31]Ibid., p. 60.

[32]Ibid., p. 67.

[33]Richard Ostling, "Of God and Greed," Time (June 8, 1987): p. 71; Referring to the Bakker-Hahn situation as an "extra-marital relationship" is not being unkind to Bakker. Arguably, it could be called an adulterous tryst or even rape.

[34]Ostling, "TV's Unholy Row," p. 60. In March 1987 following the Bakker scandal, Swaggart publicly denied ever having participated in any immoral sexual actions. Swaggart claimed that he "never had a church secretary...I married my wife when I was a kid and she's the only woman I've ever kissed." Of course this statement was to take an ironic turn for Jimmy Swaggart. Following Swaggart's comments on the Bakker scandal, Reverend Oral Roberts warned Swaggart by saying that "Satan has put something in your heart that you're better than anybody else."

[35] Richard Ostling, "A Really Bad Day at Fort Mill," Time (March 30, 1987): p. 70.

[36] Ostling, "TV's Unholy Row," p. 62.

[37]Ostling, "Of God and Greed," p. 74

[38]Ostling, "A Really Bad Day at Fort Mill," p. 70.

[39] Noreen Kruse's research sheds some insight concerning the fine line between a religious confession and a speech of apology: "It is conceivable, of course, that a religious confession can serve an apologetic function when the author is a public figure with a tarnished reputation, but the purpose of the true religious confession is not the attainment of pardon or acquittal from one's fellow human being....Implicit in the religious confession is the notion of God's absolution, not humanity's, and those who believe themselves to have been forgiven by God have no need to justify or excuse their behaviors to society." (Emphasis ours); Noreen Wales Kruse, "The Scope of Apologetic Discourse: Establishing Generic Parameters," The Southern Speech Communication Journal 46 (1981): p. 285.

Since Swaggart attempts to publicly excuse himself and needs forgiveness from his audience for his behavior, his goal goes

beyond that of confession, into that of apology, and further into audience compliance.

[40]In the past, Swaggart has been a media basher, and his subsequent speeches exemplify a return to that tactic.